#### REMARKS

# I. Status of the Application

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. In the January 31, 2008 office action, the Examiner:

- A. Allowed claims 10-20;
- B. Rejected claims 1-3 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,497,127 to Sauer;
- C. Objected to claims 4-7 and 9 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim; and
  - D. Objected to the Abstract because it was not listed on a separate page.

The allowance of claims 10-20 is gratefully acknowledged. In this response, applicants have amended claim 1 and cancelled claim 7. The abstract has also been amended.

### II. The Rejection Of Or Objection To Claims 1-6, 8 and 9 Should be Withdrawn

In the January 31, 2008 Office action, the examiner objected to claims 4-7 and 9 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but noted that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In this response, applicants have amended claim 1 to include the limitations of allowable claim 7. Claims 2-6, 8 and 9 all depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of amended claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-6, 8

and 9 are all in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the examiner's objection to or rejection of claims 1-6, 8 and 9 should be withdrawn.

# III. The Objection to the Specification Should be Withdrawn

In the January 31, 2008 Office action, the examiner objected to the specification and particularly, the abstract of the disclosure. In this response, applicants have amended the specification, and particularly the abstract, to address the examiner's objections. In view of the amendments to the specification, it is respectfully submitted that the examiner's objection to the specification should be withdrawn.

### IV. Conclusion

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted the applicant has made a patentable contribution to the art. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application is therefore respectfully requested.

In the event applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for an extension of time or payment of an additional fee, the applicant conditionally petitions therefore, and authorizes any fee deficiency to be charged to deposit account 13-0014.

Respectfully submitted,

Russell E. Fowler II

Attorney for Applicants

Attorney Registration No. 43,615

Maginot Moore & Beck

Chase Tower

111 Monument Circle, Suite 3250

Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5109

Telephone: (317) 638-2922